4/18/71

Dear Jim,

You have not yet begun to level with me on the length, extent and nature of your relationship with Sprague, nor have you begun to indicate what you have told him. I wish you could appreciate what he has already done with it and what those to whom, precisely as I warned you in advance he would, he has broadcast it, are doing. Let me take this last point first: three people discussed it with me in Washington on Friday and three at a party last night (where some drank too much), one a total stranger of whom I know absolutely nothing.

Your letter of 4/14 was much too late a time to write him. He wrote a long, three-page single spaced account 4/5, spilling the guts of all of you. It has more than sufficient identification of C for any enemies to pinpoint him and have absolutely no doubt about this identification.

I can't sympathize with your agonizing in your undated letter mailed 4/15. You were on notice, you are a grown man, you behaved like a fuzz-faced boy, you jeopardized what you say you believe in and seek, and above all you betrayed the trust of a man who can be hurt thereby. This is no business of boys, marginal paranoids or the loose-jowed. It certainly isn't for those at once mature and irresponsible.

What you can do at this point I do not know. I think I may have shut Sprague and his closer associates up, to the degree this is possible, but I would not encourage you or C to assume it is possible. And this certainly does not undo what you and he have already done. It has been and will be an extra burden for me, one of the things that required a 23-hour day of me yesterday and that I begin today with less than four hours of sleep. I'm getting to old and to weary for that.

You say you have been showing C all of my letters. Good. I enclose a copy for him. Now above all he should be without illusion. I am not going to pinpoint it, but I believe there is an area is which he can be in physical danger, as he already is subject to retaliation of other character. I will not try and persuade him to do anything, for that must be his own decision. I do offer an opinion, that his own experience should teach him that at this juncture, in the light of what has already happened, his best interest and greatest security lie in telling me everything with permission for me to place a copy with a trusted and thoroughly dependable associate unknown to any of the nuts and a copy in a safe box I have not in my own bank. I am not unaware of hazard to myself, nor is it new. It should be obvious I cannot now trust you with any indication of what I mean. Should he decide to, I suggest one of two means: registered, not certified, mail, with a return address other than his or yours on the envelope, of to the enclosed address, that of a friend who is a businessman and knows only that I have had my mail tampered with, with the envelope addressed to him and an inner, sealed envelope addressed to me. He will deliver it unopened. He is a drop I have never used. There is no need for you to know it so I have included it in the enclosed sealed envelope...It might help C's understanding and evaluation of mine to know that the week of the JFK assassination I wrote what is known as a lead-and-summary of a proposed magazine article the first sentence of which was "Lee Harvey Oswald could not have been persona non grata to the FBI"-before there even was a Warren Commission, to recall that in WHITEWASH I had enough to warrant saying Oswald's record could be explained only as part of an intelligence operation (amplified less than I could have in OSWALD IN NEW ORLEANS) and that I have in my possession and have for years proof of this, proof thought to have been officially destroyed (and of that also I have proof). There are ways in which I can come close to confirming other areas of what you represent as his knowledge, but the foregoing should be enough to tell him that what

you tell me he has told you is not new to me. More, I can give him two sets of associated numbers. Only wrong ones have been published. I am sorry I cannot get out there, but should he ever be near here and should it serve his interests or needs to see this, he can. I have no objection to his knowing that I am presently pressing for four different films withheld by the Bureau from the Commission, of which I have dubs of two, after Bureau editing, in my possession. I also have proof of at least some of what was edited out, from Bureau files, plus taped interviews with witnesses who were shown what the Commission was not. I have similar proof of an official nature not from the Bureau bearing on some of the foregoing quite directly. When I say "witnesses on tape" I mean a minimum of four on the direct point, a minimum of two on what may be a direct point, and a number of others I did not tape because by that point in my investigation it was not necessary. Aside from what is in my immediate possession, I have copies of all these things securely elsewhere.

As I am giving C a partial (and it is not complete) identification of what I have long had, I am also giving you an idea of what you have been messing up.

I do not know what relationship C had with Hosty, or how he feels about him. Sprague, by the way, is quite explicit on this:"Another friend of Jims...worked for the FBI in Kansas City and now lives in Seattle...knew agent Hosty in Kansas City" and much more. But despite his dishonesties that border on perjury, I regard Hosty as one of the unnecessary victims of all this rotten business and would like to be in a position to have him appear as less than a villain, as no worse than a man doing his officially-assigned duty. This is my belief. I believe it to be true of agents other than Hosty also, and I avoid even suggesting their identification, and not because I do not and have no long suspected it. Here I mean in identically Hosty's role. The same is true generally of agents with other responsibilities, who had no direct contact with Oswald. If you and C do not know it, Oswald was long an active Bureau case and the Bureau withheld much on him from the Commission, aside from connection....And I have relevant official information not of federal origin. Obvious, despite your transgressions. I expect you and C to keep this to yourselves. I'd not be telling you if I had any other way of telling him.

As you know, I use my phone freely, despite the feeling that it may be monitored. There are reasons you and C have no way of knowing, having no connection with anything you may know of me, and not necessarily only by or on behalf of those interested in my JFK work. However, as you also know, I do not encourage others to put on it what can involve the security of people other than me. However, because of some rather polished threats from time to time, known to the local police and specialists in a department not federal and not local with which I work, and because of the occasional need not to trust my memory and where note-taking would be inadequate, I am set up to tape conversations, promptly. I have had men once federally-connected phone me in the wee hours and begin,"For Christ's sake, tape this", and I can, instantly...I have to close. One other thing that may interest C is that I am not anti-police or anti-Bureau or anti-intelligence per se. I was, voluntarily, in intelligence, and I have cooperated with that of a friendly power, with DJ knowledge. My working with the Bureau, where they are honestly engaged in what I regard as proper activity, goes back to the 30s, when I once spent four months living with agents in the filed and on a dangerous case where six men (not agents) were killed as soon as I left. When there was no second agent available, the odd man then trusted me to cover him, armed me for it, and prepared me by teaching me both his weapons, the revolver and the automatic. They trusted me with their armored Buick and in it I ran liquor (into a dry county) for them and me.

Sincerely,